



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,915	08/04/2003	John R. Frank	113744.123 (US2)	7574
23483	7590	05/05/2008		
WILMERHALLE/BOSTON			EXAMINER	
60 STATE STREET			LIN, WEN TAI	
BOSTON, MA 02109			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
05/05/2008	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

michael.mathewson@wilmerhale.com
teresa.carvalho@wilmerhale.com
sharon.matthews@wilmerhale.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/633,915	Applicant(s) FRANK, JOHN R.
	Examiner Wen-Tai Lin	Art Unit 2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3,6-9 and 11-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3,6-9 and 11-13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 14-15 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/96/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3, 6-9 and 11-15 are presented for examination. Claims 12-15 are newly added.

2. Claims 12-13 are objected to because it is unclear what is meant by "geolocation coordinates" and how are they different from "spatial coordinates". It is noted that neither the geolocation coordinates nor the spatial coordinates is found in Applicant's specification. On the other hand, although the terms "longitude" and "latitude" have been extensively cited in the specification, they are referred as a two-dimensional metric in a spatial domain (page 3, lines 29-30) and likewise in a geographic domain (page 22, lines 11-12). For the prior art rejection in this office action, the geolocation coordinates and spatial coordinates are construed as equivalent.

Clarification and/or correction is required in response to this office action.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1, 3, 6-9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossmann et al. [U.S. PGPub 2004111669] in view of Hancock et al. [U.S. PGPub 20050283503].

5. Rossmann was cited in the previous office action.

6. As to claims 1 and 12-13, Rossmann teaches automatically extracting desired address or telephone information from a unstructured electronic text document such as a web page and send the extracted spatial identifiers to another location (such as a server on a web site or another computer [see Figs. 6-7 and paragraphs 75, 78 and 82]) for obtaining a map on which the interested addresses are located [e.g., Abstract; paragraphs 10, 55-59 and 85]. Note that the returned spatial information includes a map and/or direction to the spatial identifier (e.g., the address).

Rossmann does not specifically teach that the returned spatial information includes spatial coordinates corresponding to the spatial identifiers. However, Hancock teaches a system for querying a Universal Geographic Database (UGD) for retrieving spatial coordinates such as longitude and latitude that are associated with a given proprietary location address (i.e., spatial identifier) such as street address and other contact information [e.g., Abstract; Fig.12b; paragraph 186].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make use of Hancock's UGD for retrieving more precise geographic coordinates (i.e., by forwarding Rossmann's captured address information as input to Hancock's UGD) because the

UGD provided spatial coordinates (longitude and latitude) are textual, universal parameters which can be easily integrated into Rossmann's Personal Information Manager (PIM).

7. As to claims 3 and 6, Rossmann teaches that in general the address information is extracted from a web page. Rossmann does not specifically teach submitting and processing a plurality of client documents to the geolocating service for extracting spatial identifiers and obtaining their correspondent spatial coordinates that are indexed to each respective document.

However, submitting a plurality processing tasks as a batch is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have submitted a plurality of web pages, when they are available, to Rossmann's spatial identifier capturing and Hancock's geolocating service system because it saves human labor from interfacing the system on a per-document basis.

8. As to claims 7-8, Rossmann and Hancock do not specifically teach how the address associated with the server is obtained.

However, it is well known in the art of Internet surfing that a user may use a popular search engine to find a desired service and bookmark the address to its local memory.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a first user of Rossmann and Hancock's system to adopt the

same approach by searching on the Internet for said address associated with the server that provides a geolocating service to users and subsequently read said address from a local memory because it is convenient to find a service provider's address by searching the Internet, followed by book-marking the acquired address.

9. As to claims 9 and 11, Rossmann and Hancock do not specifically teach that the documents are transferred back to the client computer along with the geolocation information or extracted spatial identifiers.

However, Rossmann teaches that the unstructured text from which the spatial identifiers is contained in web pages and there are many different ways to promote various subsequent services/operations based on the web pages that have been served to a user [e.g., paragraphs 45 – 67]. As such, it is an obvious option to transfer back the documents along with results of selected various services associated with the pages because it facilitates the correlation between the input and output data by transferring the original documents along with the results.

10. Claims 14-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 6-9 and 11 on 3/20/08 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday(8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(571) 273-8300 for official communications; and

(571) 273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

April 28, 2008

/Wen-Tai Lin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154